

TPBU-11-95

cond-mat/9601083

December 1995

UPPER AND LOWER BOUNDS ON THE PARTITION FUNCTION OF THE HOFSTADTER MODEL

ALEXANDER MOROZ^{*†}

*School of Physics and Space Research, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston,
Birmingham B15 2TT, U. K.*

and

*The Erwin Schrödinger International Institute for Mathematical Physics,
Pasteurgasse 6, A-1090 Wien, Austria*

ABSTRACT

Using unitary equivalence of magnetic translation operators, explicit upper and lower convex bounds on the partition function of the Hofstadter model are given for any rational “flux” and any value of Bloch momenta. These bounds (i) generalize straightforwardly to the case of a general asymmetric hopping and to the case of hopping of the form $t_{jn}(S_j^n + S_j^{-n})$ with n arbitrary integer larger than or equal 2, and (ii) allow to derive bounds on the derivatives of the partition function.

PACS numbers : 72.15.Gd, 64.60.Cn

(to appear in Mod. Phys. Lett. B)

^{*}On leave from Institute of Physics, Na Slovance 2, CZ-180 40 Praha 8, Czech Republic

[†]e-mail address : am@ph.th.bham.ac.uk

1 Introduction

In what follows, we shall consider the Hofstadter model [1] described by the Hamiltonian

$$H = t_1(S_1 + S_1^*) + t_2(S_2 + S_2^*), \quad (1)$$

where unitary operators S_1 and S_2 , sometimes called magnetic translation operators, satisfy the commutation relation

$$S_1 S_2 = \omega S_2 S_1, \quad (2)$$

with

$$\omega = \exp(-2\pi i \alpha), \quad (3)$$

α being a real number. In general we shall allow for additional hopping terms of the form $t_{jn}(S_j^n + S_j^{-n})$ with n arbitrary integer larger than or equal 2. However, as will become clear later, our results generalize straightforwardly the symmetric case $t_1 = t_2$ with nearest-neighbour hopping. Therefore, for the sake of clarity, we shall firstly derive our bounds for $t_1 = t_2$ and then the relevant generalization for the case $t_1 \neq t_2$ and additional hopping terms is discussed afterwards.

The model (1) appears in many physical problems. Originally, it appeared in the study of the behaviour of electrons moving simultaneously in a periodic potential and an uniform magnetic field B [2]. Subsequently, it has been also used in early discussions of the integer quantum Hall effect [3], to describe superlattices and quasicrystals [4], and flux phases in the high- T_c superconductors [5]. In the case of lattice electrons moving in an uniform magnetic field B , the parameter $\alpha (\equiv \Phi/\Phi_0)$ is the flux per unit cell measured in units of flux quantum $\Phi_0 (\equiv hc/|e|)$, and, in the Landau gauge $\mathbf{A} = (-By, 0, 0)$,

$$S_1 = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}(\hat{p}_1 + \frac{e}{c}By)} = e^{\partial_1 + 2\pi i \alpha y}, \quad (4)$$

and

$$S_2 = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\hat{p}_2} = e^{\partial_2}. \quad (5)$$

In the case where $\alpha = p/q$ is rational with p and q relative prime integers, the model is known to enjoy $SL(2, Z)$ symmetry [6], and, because of the periodicity over an enlarged unit cell [7], one can define Bloch momenta, $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, k_2)$, and a corresponding magnetic

Brillouin zone [1]. In momentum space, the Hamiltonian H and operators S_1 and S_2 can be written as $q \times q$ traceless matrices,

$$H(k_1, k_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \cos k_1 & e^{ik_2} & \dots & e^{-ik_2} \\ e^{-ik_2} & 2 \cos(k_1 + 2\pi\alpha) & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-ik_2} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & e^{ik_2} \\ e^{ik_2} & \dots & e^{-ik_2} & 2 \cos[k_1 + 2(q-1)\pi\alpha] \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

$$S_1 = e^{ik_1} \bar{S}_1 = e^{ik_1} \begin{pmatrix} \omega^0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega^{-1} & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \omega^{-(q-2)} & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \omega^{-(q-1)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

$$S_2 = e^{ik_2} \bar{S}_2 = e^{ik_2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

Despite its simple form and the extensive numerical knowledge available, the Hofstadter model defies exact solution (see Ref. [8] for a recent progress). Here, we shall concentrate on the partition function,

$$Z(\beta, k_1, k_2) = \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H(k_1, k_2)}, \quad (9)$$

where $\beta = 1/T$ and T is temperature. The total partition function is then given by the relation

$$Z(\beta) = \int_{BZ} Z(\beta, k_1, k_2) \frac{d^2 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^2}, \quad (10)$$

where the integral is over the Brillouin zone. The calculation of the partition function $Z(\beta, k_1, k_2)$ can be viewed as a technical tool to calculate the density of states $\rho(E, k_1, k_2)$ [9], because $Z(\beta, k_1, k_2)$ is nothing but the Laplace transform of $\rho(E, k_1, k_2)$,

$$Z(\beta, k_1, k_2) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\beta E} \rho(E, k_1, k_2) dE. \quad (11)$$

2 Results

We are not yet able to calculate the partition function $Z(\beta, k_1, k_2)$ exactly, however, we shall formulate upper and lower bounds on $Z(\beta, k_1, k_2)$, which hold for any rational $\alpha = p/q$. To derive the lower bound on $Z(\beta, k_1, k_2)$, we shall use the Peierls variational principle [10] which states that

$$Z(\beta) = \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta H) \geq \sum_n e^{-\beta(\Phi_n, H\Phi_n)}, \quad (12)$$

where $\{\Phi_n\}$ is an arbitrary set of linearly independent normalized vectors in a Hilbert space. Eventually, to obtain the upper bound on $Z(\beta, k_1, k_2)$, we shall use the Golden-Thompson inequality [11],

$$\text{Tr} e^{A+B} \leq \text{Tr} (e^A e^B), \quad (13)$$

valid for self-adjoint operators A and B .

Abstract inequalities (12) and (13) are well known, however, it is difficult to calculate the traces involved and to obtain explicit analytic bounds in general case. In the present case, by taking $A \equiv S_1 + S_1^*$ and $B \equiv S_2 + S_2^*$, we shall calculate e^A , e^B , and the traces in Eqs. (12) and (13) explicitly and we shall show that for all β , k_1 , and k_2 ,

$$q \leq \max \left(\text{Tr} e^{-\beta A}, \text{Tr} e^{-\beta B} \right) \leq Z(\beta, k_1, k_2) \leq \frac{1}{q} \left(\text{Tr} e^{-\beta A} \right) \left(\text{Tr} e^{-\beta B} \right), \quad (14)$$

where

$$\text{Tr} e^{-\beta A} = \sum_{l=1}^q Q(k_1, l), \quad \text{Tr} e^{-\beta B} = \sum_{l=1}^q Q(k_2, l), \quad (15)$$

and

$$Q(k, l) = \exp\{-2\beta \cos[k + 2\pi\alpha(l-1)]\}. \quad (16)$$

Bounds (14), which constitute the main result of our paper, are valid for β of both sign, positive and negative, and they are saturated for $\beta = 0$, i.e., at infinite temperature. The upper bound on Z in (14) follows from (13) using the *clustering property* of $\text{Tr} e^A e^B = (1/q) \text{Tr} e^A \text{Tr} e^B$ to be derived below. This clustering property is particular to the Hofstadter model and does not depend on β and the hopping parameters.

Both upper and lower bounds on the partition function in (14) are convex functions in variable β (and hopping parameters t_1 and t_2), as the partition function itself. Given convexity of e^{-x} , the first inequality (from the left) in (14) follows from the Jensen inequality

[12] and the fact that $\sum_{l=1}^q \cos[k + 2\pi\alpha(l-1)] = 0$ for all k . Using simple arguments presented in [13], bounds (14) are used in Sec. 4 to derive bounds on the derivatives of the partition function with respect to β , t_1 , and t_2 .

3 Calculation of traces and derivation of bounds

The main step in calculating traces in Eqs. (12) and (13) and deriving bounds (14) is to use the *unitary equivalence* of operators $\bar{S}_1$ and $\bar{S}_2$ defined by relations (7) and (8). Indeed, one has

$$\bar{S}_2 = U\bar{S}_1U^{-1}, \quad (17)$$

where U is the unitary matrix with elements given by

$$U_{lm} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}} \omega^{-(l-1)(m-1)} \omega \dots \omega^{(m-1)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}} \omega^{-(l-1)(m-1)+m(m-1)/2}. \quad (18)$$

By direct calculation,

$$[U\bar{S}_1U^{-1}]_{ik} = \sum_{l=1}^q U_{il} U_{kl}^* \omega^{-(l-1)} = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{l=1}^q \omega^{(l-1)(k-i)} \omega^{-(l-1)} = \delta_{i,k-1}. \quad (19)$$

One can verify that $U_{l+q,m} = U_{l,m}$ and

$$U_{l,m+q} = \begin{cases} U_{l,m}, & q \text{ odd} \\ -U_{l,m}, & q \text{ even.} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

For all j and l (summation over repeated indices suppressed),

$$U_{jl}^* U_{jl} = \frac{1}{q}. \quad (21)$$

In general,

$$U_{jl}^* U_{jk} = \frac{1}{q} \omega^{-(j-1)(k-l)} \left[\omega \dots \omega^{|k-l|} \right]^{1 \times \text{sgn}(k-l)} = \frac{1}{q} \omega^{-(j-1)(k-l) + \text{sgn}(k-l) \times |k-l|(|k-l|+1)/2}. \quad (22)$$

The action of U on the Hamiltonian H , UHU^{-1} , interchanges momenta k_1 and k_2 and implies that the spectrum of H is symmetric under this interchange. It also allows to show that the spectrum of H is equivalent to the spectrum of the Hamiltonian $\bar{H}$ of the form

$$\bar{H} = U^{-1/2} D_1 U^{1/2} + U^{1/2} D_2 U^{-1/2}, \quad (23)$$

where D_1 and D_2 are real diagonal matrices, $(D)_{lm} = 2 \cos(k + 2\pi\alpha l) \delta_{lm}$, with subscript labelling the dependence on either k_1 or k_2 .

Due to (17), both $\bar{S}_1$ and $\bar{S}_2$ have *the same* spectrum Σ [14] which can be read off from (7), i.e.,

$$\Sigma = \{\omega^{-j} \mid j = 0, 1, \dots, q-1\}. \quad (24)$$

Normalized eigenvectors of $\bar{S}_1$ are $(\Phi_j)_l = \delta_{jl}$, and corresponding normalized eigenvectors of $\bar{S}_2$ are

$$\Psi_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}} \left(1, \omega^{-j}, \omega^{-2j}, \dots, \omega^{-(q-1)j} \right). \quad (25)$$

One can verify that, in the standard scalar product in C^q , $(\Phi_j, \Phi_l) = (\Psi_j, \Psi_l) = \delta_{jl}$. The lower bound on $Z(\beta)$ in (14) then follows from the Peierls variational principle (12) by taking the complete set of vectors to be the set of eigenvectors of either S_1 or S_2 . Indeed, one has

$$(\Phi_j, H\Phi_j) = 2 \cos(k_1 + 2\pi\alpha j), \quad (\Psi_j, H\Psi_j) = 2 \cos(k_2 + 2\pi\alpha j). \quad (26)$$

The same lower bound can be also obtained from the Bogoliubov variational principle [15],

$$-\beta F \geq \ln \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta \tilde{H}) - \beta \left\{ \text{Tr} \left[\exp(-\beta \tilde{H})(H - \tilde{H}) \right] / \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta \tilde{H}) \right\}, \quad (27)$$

where $\tilde{H}$ is a trial Hamiltonian which is not necessarily a dynamical operator. One uses the Bogoliubov variational principle (27) with $\tilde{H}$ to be chosen either of the operators A and B . In the case of general Bloch momenta k_1 and k_2 , one has

$$e^A = e^{S_1 + S_1^*} = \text{diag} \left\{ e^{2 \cos[k_1 + 2\pi(l-1)\alpha]} \right\}, \quad e^B = e^{S_2 + S_2^*} = U \text{diag} \left\{ e^{2 \cos[k_2 + 2\pi(l-1)\alpha]} \right\} U^{-1}. \quad (28)$$

The second term on the right side of Eq. (27) then vanishes [16] and the remaining term gives the lower bound in (14) on the partition function $Z(\beta, k_1, k_2)$, valid for any rational α and for all β , k_1 , and k_2 .

As for the upper bound (14) on $Z(\beta, k_1, k_2)$, using Eqs. (28) and (21) one has

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \left(e^{-\beta A} e^{-\beta B} \right) &= \sum_{jl} Q(k_1, l) Q(k_2, j) U_{lj}^* U_{lj} = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{j,l=1}^q Q(k_1, l) Q(k_2, j) \\ &= \frac{1}{q} \left(\text{Tr} e^{-\beta A} \right) \left(\text{Tr} e^{-\beta B} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

which is the clustering property mentioned above. Combining Eq. (29) with the Golden-Thompson inequality (13) then gives the upper bound (14) on $Z(\beta, k_1, k_2)$,

$$Z(\beta, k_1, k_2) \leq \frac{1}{q} \left(\text{Tr } e^{-\beta A} \right) \left(\text{Tr } e^{-\beta B} \right), \quad (30)$$

valid for any rational $\alpha = p/q$ and for all β , k_1 , and k_2 .

4 Further generalizations

For a given β , one can check numerically that [after dividing (14) by q] the upper and lower bounds on $Z(\beta, k_1, k_2)$ depend only very weakly upon q and Bloch momenta. The dependence of the bounds on β is much stronger. As β increases,

$$\max \left(\text{Tr } e^{-\beta A}, \text{Tr } e^{-\beta B} \right) / Z(\beta, k_1, k_2) \approx e^{-2\beta} \rightarrow 0. \quad (31)$$

Therefore, the lower bound is far from being optimal and, in principle, it can be further improved using the Peierls variational principle (12) with a better choice of the complete set of vectors than used here. With respect to large β behaviour, the upper bound (14) on $Z(\beta, k_1, k_2)$ is much better because it mimicks the large β behaviour of $Z(\beta, k_1, k_2)$. The upper bound can also be further improved: by repeatedly using inequality [11]

$$\text{Tr } (XY)^{2^{m+1}} \leq \text{Tr } (X^2 Y^2)^{2^m} \quad (32)$$

for nonnegative matrices X and Y , with m integral and ≥ 0 , together with the Trotter formula,

$$e^{A+B} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(e^{A/n} e^{B/n} \right)^n. \quad (33)$$

One finds for $2 \leq l \leq m$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr } (e^{-\beta A} e^{-\beta B}) &\geq \text{Tr } (e^{-\beta A/2} e^{-\beta B/2})^2 \geq \text{Tr } (e^{-\beta A/l} e^{-\beta B/l})^l \\ &\geq (e^{-\beta A/m} e^{-\beta B/m})^m \geq \text{Tr } e^{-\beta H} = Z(\beta). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Note that relation (22) enables us to calculate explicitly

$$\left[e^{-\beta(S_1 + S_1^{-1})} e^{-\beta(S_2 + S_2^{-1})} \right]_{lm} = \omega^{\text{sgn}(m-l) \times |m-l|(|m-l|+1)/2} Q(k_1, l) \tilde{Q}(k_2, m-l), \quad (35)$$

where $\tilde{Q}(k_2, m-l)$ is a discrete Fourier transform,

$$\tilde{Q}(k_2, m-l) \equiv \frac{1}{q} \sum_j \omega^{-(j-1)(m-l)} Q(k_2, j). \quad (36)$$

Obviously, in the asymmetric case, $t_1 \neq t_2$, and even in the case where hopping has the form $t_{jn}(S_j^n + S_j^{-n})$ with $n \geq 2$ arbitrary integer, one can still use the unitary equivalence (17) with the matrix U given by Eq. (18). One writes $H = A + B$, where matrix A (B) now includes all hopping terms in the x -direction (y -direction) and proceeds with matrices A and B as before, i.e., uses them as the trial Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}$ in the Bogoliubov variational principle (27) and in the Golden-Thompson inequality (13). Inclusion of hopping terms $t_{jn}(S_j^n + S_j^{-n})$ in the Hamiltonian H does not change the form of bounds (14) and involves only modification of $Q(k, l)$. For example, in the asymmetric case, $t_1 \neq t_2$, with the nearest-neighbour hopping, the only change in bounds (14) consists in replacing A by $t_1 A$ and B by $t_2 B$.

5 Bounds on derivatives of $Z(\beta, k_1, k_2)$

The partition function $Z(\beta, k_1, k_2)$ as a function of β and the hopping parameters t_1 and t_2 is a *convex* function. Adapting simple arguments presented in [13] for a *concave* function, one can use bounds (14) to derive bounds on the derivatives of the partition function with respect to β , t_1 , and t_2 . Indeed, let $f(v)$ be a convex function, i.e., $f''(v) \geq 0$. Let us denote by $f^\pm(v)$ the upper/lower bound on f at the point v . Then

$$\frac{f^+(v_0) - f^-(v_1)}{v_0 - v_1} \leq f'(v_0) \leq \frac{f^+(v_0) - f^-(v_2)}{v_0 - v_2}, \quad (37)$$

where $v_1 < v_0 < v_2$. Inequality (37) then implies, for example,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\beta_0 - \beta_1} \left\{ \frac{1}{q} \left(\text{Tr } e^{-\beta_0 A} \right) \left(\text{Tr } e^{-\beta_0 B} \right) - \max \left(\text{Tr } e^{-\beta_1 A}, \text{Tr } e^{-\beta_1 B} \right) \right\} &\leq \frac{\partial Z}{\partial \beta}(\beta_0, k_1, k_2) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\beta_0 - \beta_2} \left\{ \frac{1}{q} \left(\text{Tr } e^{-\beta_0 A} \right) \left(\text{Tr } e^{-\beta_0 B} \right) - \max \left(\text{Tr } e^{-\beta_2 A}, \text{Tr } e^{-\beta_2 B} \right) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where $\beta_1 < \beta_0 < \beta_2$.

6 Conclusions

To conclude, we have calculated traces involved in general bounds on the partition function [Eqs. (12) and (13)] and established explicit upper and lower bounds on the partition function of the Hofstadter model [Eq. (14)] and its derivatives [Eq. (38)], valid for any rational “flux” α , inverse temperature β , and Bloch momenta k_1 and k_2 . Bounds (14) are saturated for $\beta = 0$ and, in the asymmetric case, if either t_1 or t_2 approaches zero.

Bounds (14) also imply constraints on the density of states of the Hofstadter model and supply constraints imposed by the coefficients of the secular equation for the Hofstadter model,

$$\det(\lambda \mathbf{I} - H) = \lambda^q + a_{q-2}\lambda^{q-2} + a_{q-4}\lambda^{q-4} + \dots + \det H = 0. \quad (39)$$

Here, depending on whether q is odd or even, either $\det H = 2[\cos(qk_1) + \cos(qk_2)]$ or $\det H = 4 - 2[\cos(qk_1) + \cos(qk_2)]$. One can show that $a_{q-(2l+1)} \equiv 0$, $a_{q-2} = -2q$,

$$\begin{aligned} a_{q-4} &= q(2q - 7) - 2q \cos(2\pi\alpha), \\ a_{q-6} &= -\frac{2}{3}q(2q^2 - 21q + 58) + 4q(q - 6) \cos(2\pi\alpha) - 4q \cos(4\pi\alpha), \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

[17] and that except for the constant term, $\det H$, none of the coefficients a_j depends on the Bloch momenta.

I should like to thank A. Comtet for discussions and suggestions at an early stage of this work, and R.C. Jones for careful reading of the manuscript. I also thank the Erwin Schrödinger International Institute in Wien, where part of this work was done, for its hospitality. This work was supported by the UK EPSRC Grant GR/J35214 and by the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic under Project No. 202/93/0689.

References

- [1] D. R. Hofstadter, *Phys. Rev. B* **14**, 2239 (1976)
- [2] P. G. Harper, *Proc. Phys. Soc. Lond. A* **68**, 874 (1955)
M. Ya. Azbel, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **46**, 929 (1964)
G. H. Wannier, *Phys. Stat. Solidi B* **88**, 757 (1978)
G. H. Wannier, G. M. Obermair, and R. and Ray, *Phys. Stat. Solidi B* **93**, 337 (1976)

- [3] P. Středa, *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **15** L717, L1299 (1982)
D. J. Thouless, M. Kohmoto, M. Nightingale, and M. den Nijs, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 405 (1982)
- [4] M. Kohmoto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 1198 (1983)
D. J. Thouless, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **127**, 187 (1990)
D. J. Thouless and Y. Tan, *Physica A* **177**, 567 (1991)
- [5] I. Affleck and J. B. Marston, *Phys. Rev. B* **37**, 3774 (1988)
- [6] V. A. Mandelstam and S. Y. Jitomirskaya, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **139**, 589 (1991)
A. Moroz, *Mod. Phys. Lett. B* **6**, 717 (1992)
- [7] One possible choice is, for example, a unit cell with q lattice spacings in the y direction and one lattice spacing in the x direction.
- [8] P. B. Wiegmann and A. V. Zabrodin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 1890 (1994)
L. D. Faddeev and R. M. Kashaev, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **169**, 181 (1995)
Y. Hatsugai, M. Kohmoto, and Y. S. Wu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 1134 (1994)
- [9] Using transfer matrix [1], it can be shown that the spectrum of the Hamiltonian H lies within the interval $[-4, 4]$. Therefore, in order to use the formula (11), one must, instead of H , consider the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H} = H + 4 \geq 0$.
- [10] R. E. Peierls, *Phys. Rev.* **54**, 918 (1938)
- [11] S. Golden, *Phys. Rev.* **137**, B1127 (1965)
C. J. Thompson, *J. Math. Phys.* **6**, 1812 (1965)
- [12] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya, *Inequalities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934) p. 74
- [13] M. E. Fisher, *J. Chem. Phys.* **42**, 3852 (1965)
- [14] Provided q is a *prime* number then all nontrivial powers $\bar{S}_j^l$, $j = 1, 2$, $l \neq 0 \bmod q$, of these operators have the *same* spectrum Σ .

- [15] M. D. Girardeau, *J. Chem. Phys.* **40**, 899 (1964)
W. Byers Brown, *ibid.* **41**, 2945 (1964)
- [16] One can check by direct calculation that $\text{Tr } DB = 0$ for any diagonal matrix D .
- [17] A. Moroz and E. Thiran, 1992 unpublished